



## CATEX CHECKLIST

### CHECKLIST OF EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES & SENSITIVE RESOURCES IN SUPPORT OF A CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (CATEX) DETERMINATION FOR A DENALI COMMISSION PROJECT

<b>Program Partner Name</b> Newtok Village Council		<b>Project Name</b> Project Management and Other Village Relocation Support Services	
<b>Location</b> Mertarvik, AK	<b>Project #</b> 1491	<b>Subproject #</b>	
<b>Identify Categorical Exclusion</b> The proposed project is identified in the Denali Commission list of categorical exclusions in 45 CFR Appendix A to Part 900, paragraph(s)		B3	
<b>Project Description</b> (2-3 sentences maximum) Construction of the Mertarvik Evacuation Center (MEC) on the existing foundation. This project will erect the exterior shell, approximately 7000 sq ft, and the mechanical and electrical systems.			
<b>Instructions</b> The information you provide below will assist the Denali Commission in making its determination as to whether a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) is appropriate or further environmental analysis is required for the proposed project. Please place a checkmark in the blank next to the numbered items indicating your response on that issue. A checkmark in the "Yes" block does not automatically preclude the development of the proposed project. It simply means further assessment is needed. Should you have any remarks that may indicate the need to prepare an Environmental Analysis (EA) or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), attach a brief explanation of the circumstances for further evaluation. Adverse affects to environmentally sensitive resources must be resolved through another environmental process, e.g., coordination or consultation under the Coastal Zone Management Act or National Historic Preservation Act, before being categorically excluded. Attachments are allowed and encouraged.			


Extraordinary Circumstances	Determination		Basis for determination
	Yes	No	
<b>1. Public Health, Safety or Environment</b> Will the proposed project have a reasonably likelihood of significant impacts on public health, public safety, or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The building may improve public safety if an evacuation of Newtok is necessary.
<b>2. Controversy on Environmental Grounds</b> Will the proposed project have effects on the environment that are likely to be highly controversial or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steel pile foundation constructed in 2011. This project constructs building on existing foundation.
<b>3. Uncertain, Unique or Unknown Risks</b> Will the proposed project have possible effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain, involve unique or unknown risks, or are scientifically controversial?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is next step in ongoing relocation of Newtok.
<b>4. Precedent for Future Action</b> Will the proposed action establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Newtok is in process of moving to Mertarvik. This building is part of the existing plan.
<b>5. Cumulative Impacts</b> Will the proposed project relate to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The entire Mertarvik infrastructure development was analyzed in 2018 draft EIS and no significant environmental effects were identified.
<b>6. Scope and Size</b> Will the proposed project have a greater size and scope than is normal for the category of action?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7000 sq ft is reasonable for a community building in rural Alaska.

<b>7. Environmental Conditions</b> Will the proposed project have the potential to degrade already existing poor environmental conditions or to initiate a degrading influence, activity or effect in areas not already significantly modified from their natural condition?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The existing foundation is part of the community plan. There are houses, other buildings, and roads in the immediate vicinity.
<b>8. Environmental Justice</b> Will the proposed project have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations?  Ref: Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project will benefit the community.
<b>9. Indian Sacred Sites</b> Will the proposed project limit access to or ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites? (EO 13007)  <i>"Indian tribe" means an Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior acknowledges to exist as an Indian tribe pursuant to Public Law No. 103-454, 108 Stat. 4791, and "Indian" refers to a member of such an Indian tribe. (EO 13007)</i>  Ref: Executive Order 13007, Indian Sacred Sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There are no Indian sacred sites in the area.
<b>Sensitive Resources</b>	Impact Potential		Basis for determination
	Yes	No	
<b>10. Section 106 Historic Properties</b> Will the proposed project adversely affect properties in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places?  Ref: National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.), as amended. (See 36 CFR 800, Protection of Historic Properties).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The nearest archaeological site is approximately one mile from the project site.
<b>11. Endangered Species</b> Will the proposed project adversely affect species listed, or proposed to be listed on the Endangered or Threatened Species List, or the specific critical habitat?  Ref: Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), as amended. (See 50 CFR part 402).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The 2008 EA and FONSI for the MEC by USACE reviewed Endangered Species of the region and concluded none would be affected by the project.
<b>12. Historic or Cultural Resources</b> Will the proposed action adversely impact the historic and cultural environment of the Nation?  Ref: Executive Order 11593, Protection and enhancement of the cultural environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project will protect the cultural heritage of Newtok Village tribe by allowing them to maintain their community.
<b>13. Park, Recreation or Refuge Lands</b> Will the proposed project have significant adverse direct or indirect effects on National or State Park, Recreation or Refuge lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Congress authorized land exchange between Newtok Village Corporation and U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 2003.
<b>14. Wilderness Areas</b> Will the proposed project adversely impact a wilderness area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There are no designated wilderness areas in the vicinity.

Ref: Wilderness Act of 1964 (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), as amended.			
<b>15. Wild and Scenic Rivers</b> Is the proposed project a "Water Resources Project" that will impact a wild, scenic or recreational river area and create conditions inconsistent with the character of the river?  Ref: Wild & Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.), as amended.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is not a Water Resource Project.
<b>16. National Natural Landmarks</b> Will the proposed project impact a National Natural Landmark?  Ref: Historic Sites Act of 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), as amended.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There are no National Natural Landmarks in the vicinity.
<b>17. Sole Source Aquifers</b> If the proposed action would not have adverse effects on this resource, it may be considered that there is no Impact Potential.  Ref: Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, (42 U.S.C. 201, 300 et seq., and 21 U.S.C. 349), as amended. (See 40 CFR part 149).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	According to the EPA website, as of 08/05/04, there are no sole source aquifers in Alaska.
<b>18. Prime Farmlands</b> Will the proposed project convert significant agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses?  Ref: Farmlands Protection Policy Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.), as amended. (See 7 CFR part 658).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There are no agricultural lands in the vicinity.
<b>19. Wetlands</b> Will the proposed project adversely affect wetlands or will there be construction in wetlands, except in conformance with a U.S. Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit?  Ref: Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Building will be built on existing foundation; there will be no ground disturbing activities.
<b>20. Floodplains</b> Will the proposed project involve construction in a floodplain or impact floodplain development?  Ref: Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The building site is not in a floodplain.
<b>21. National Monuments</b> Will proposed project impact a National Monument?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No National Monuments in the vicinity.
<b>22. Ecologically Significant or Critical Areas</b> Will the proposed project impact an ecologically significant or critical area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The building will be on the existing foundation.
<b>23. Other Known Reasons</b> Is an environmental assessment required for other known reasons?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No known reason to do an EA.



**Additional Comments****PREPARED BY**

<b>Date</b> 03/15/18	<b>Typed or Printed Name and Title</b> Chris Allard	<b>Signature</b> 
Organization: Denali Commission		
<b>DENALI COMMISSION APPROVING OFFICIAL</b>		
Based upon the categorical exclusion identified above, this completed checklist and attachments, I certify to the best of my knowledge, that the information provided above is complete and correct, and that:		
A categorical exclusion determination is appropriate for this project		Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No: <input type="checkbox"/>
Further environmental analysis is required		Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Date</b> 3/16/18	<b>Typed or Printed Name and Title</b> Joel Neimeyer, Federal Co-Chair	<b>Signature</b> 

**Additional Notes and Instructions**

1. The basis for determination and documentation information must be traceable and establish the factual data to support the response to each question. Types of information to be included in this column are outlined below.

**Printed Materials:** These are useful sources of detailed information materials such as comprehensive land use plans, zoning maps, city master plans, environmental baseline surveys, environmental assessments, environmental impact statements and studies. Information must be current and must represent accepted methodologies, i.e., not so old that changing conditions make them irrelevant. Citations for the material should include enough information so that an outside reviewer can locate the specific reference, e.g., author, document title, publication date, and page number.

Examples include the Record of Decision, Finding of Suitability to Transfer, Finding of Suitability to Lease, General Services Administration (GSA) Property Suitability Determination Form, Federal Property Information Checklist, Environmental Baseline Surveys, Preliminary Assessment Reports, Environmental Assessments, draft or final Environmental Impact Statements, and City/County master plan or zoning map.

Possible sources of the above documents include as appropriate, GSA, Department of Housing and Urban Development, the property owner, military base environmental office, local governmental organizations, local public library, and City/County planning office.

**Personal Contacts:** Personal contacts are useful when the individual contacted is an accepted authority on the subject(s), and the interview is documented. Supporting documentation should include the name, organization, and title of the person contacted and the date of the conversation. Examples include EPA officials, EPA hotlines, officials from state or local

planning offices and environmental offices, or an environmental officer of an agency.

Site Visits: A site visit does not usually involve any testing or measurements. A site visit is an important method for initial screening of the issues, but for some of the categories it may be inadequate for final evaluation. Supporting documentation should include date of the site visit, by whom, and the supporting observation.

2. The agency must include pollution prevention considerations in the siting, design, construction, renovation, and operation of the project or facility. The questionnaire items on sedimentation and erosion control measures and storm water control plan are also pollution prevention related.

